



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,572	12/12/2003	Johan Rune	P18099US2	1868
27045	7590	03/03/2008	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			CHRISS, ANDREW W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/734,572	Applicant(s) RUNE ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew Chriss	Art Unit 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/3/2004 and 10/18/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. **Claims 1-62** provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 41 of copending Application No. 10735047 in view of Morrow (United States Patent 5,111,453) and Rune (United States Patent Application Publication US 2001/0005368).

Regarding Claims 1-31 of the instant application, claim 1 of copending Application No. 10735047 discloses the method step of receiving data packets from both a shared medium network and a point-to-point network. However, said claim may not disclose filtering each data packet from the shared medium network based on destination address. In the same field of endeavor, Morrow discloses filter/forwarding decisions in a LAN based on a received packet's

destination address (column 4, lines 39-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the LAN packet filtering disclosed in Morrow with the packet receipt disclosed in claim 1 of copending Application No. 10735047 in order to implement an address recognition method in a LAN bridge. However, the aforementioned references may not disclose filtering data packets received from a point-to-point network based on a broadcast type. In the same field of endeavor, Rune discloses multiple types of broadcast messages, one of which may be cancelled (paragraph 0072). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the broadcast message cancellation disclosed in Rune with the packet receipt disclosed in claim 1 of copending Application No. 10735047 in order to reduce redundant sending of broadcast messages in a network.

Regarding Claims 32-62 of the instant application, Claim 32 contains substantially the same subject matter as Claim 1 of the instant application, claimed as a system. Claim 41 of copending Application No. 10735047 contains substantially the same subject matter as Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10735047, claimed as a system.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claims 1-31** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. **Claim 1** lacks antecedent for claim language "said broadcast type." Claims 2-31 are rejected due to their dependence on Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. **Claims 1, 32, and 33** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vij et al (United States Patent Application Publication US 2002/0196771 A1), hereinafter Vij, in view of Morrow and Rune.

Regarding Claim 1, Vij is directed to a bridge interconnecting a wireless personal area network (point-to-point network) and a wireless local area network (shared medium network). Specifically, Vij discloses a bi-directional protocol flow between a Bluetooth terminal and a LAN network (Figure 4), thus showing the processing of received packets from both a point-to-point network and a shared medium network. However, Vij may not disclose filtering each data

packet from the shared medium network based on destination address. In the same field of endeavor, Morrow discloses filter/forwarding decisions in a LAN based on a received packet's destination address (column 4, lines 39-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the LAN packet filtering disclosed in Morrow with the Bluetooth-LAN bridge disclosed in Vij in order to implement an address recognition method in a LAN bridge. However, the aforementioned references may not disclose filtering data packets received from a point-to-point network based on a broadcast type. In the same field of endeavor, Rune discloses multiple types of broadcast messages, one of which may be cancelled (paragraph 0072). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the broadcast message cancellation disclosed in Rune with the Bluetooth-LAN bridge disclosed in Vij in order to reduce redundant sending of broadcast messages in a network.

Claims 32 and 33 contain substantially the same subject matter as Claim 1, claimed as a system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Chriss whose telephone number is 571-272-1774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/734,572
Art Unit: 2619

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chriss
Examiner
Art Unit 2619

AC



CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600